

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001	03-md-1570 (GBD)(SN) ECF Case
This document relates to:  <i>Thomas Burnett, Sr., et al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran, et al.</i>	15-cv-9903 (GBD)(SN) ECF Case

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW FOR ENTRY OF PARTIAL  
FINAL DEFAULT JUDGMENT ON BEHALF OF  
BURNETT/IRAN PLAINTIFF IDENTIFIED AT EXHIBIT A**

**(BURNETT / IRAN XXII)**

For the reasons set forth below and in the accompanying declaration of John M. Eubanks (“Eubanks Declaration”), the Plaintiff identified in Exhibit A<sup>1</sup> to the Eubanks Declaration filed contemporaneously with this application, by and through counsel, Motley Rice LLC, respectfully moves this Court for an Order awarding (1) compensatory damages for pain and suffering in the same per estate amount previously awarded by this Court regarding other estates of decedents killed in the September 11 attacks; (2) prejudgment interest at the rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually for the period from September 11, 2001 until the date of the judgment; (3) permission for the *Burnett/Iran* plaintiff identified in Exhibit A to seek punitive damages or other damages at a later date; and (4) for all other *Burnett/Iran* Plaintiffs not appearing on Exhibit A, to submit applications for damages awards in later stages, to the extent such awards have not previously been addressed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The references throughout this document to “Exhibit A” are to Exhibit A to the Eubanks Declaration dated February 11, 2020, filed contemporaneously with this motion.

Plaintiffs sued The Islamic Republic of Iran, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, and the Central Bank of the Islamic Republic of Iran (collectively, “the Iran Defendants”) in connection with the 9/11 Attacks. On December 1, 2016, all plaintiffs in the action *Thomas Burnett, Sr., et al. v. The Islamic Republic of Iran, et al.*, Case No. 15-cv-9903 (GBD)(SN) (“*Burnett/Iran*”), moved for judgment as to liability only. 15-cv-9903 ECF Nos. 65, 66, amended on December 6, 2016, 15-cv-9903 ECF Nos. 68, 69. On January 31, 2017, the Court granted plaintiffs’ application for judgment as to liability only. 15-cv-9903 ECF No. 85. The plaintiff that is party to this application, as identified in Exhibits A, is but one of the plaintiffs who have been granted judgment as to liability only, and relies on that judgment as to liability only for the request for default judgment as to pain and suffering damages. The plaintiff identified in Exhibit A now requests entry of partial final default judgment against the Iran Defendants as to the claim in the amount indicated in Exhibit A.

## **I. Procedural Background**

### **a. Related Cases**

Relying on evidence and arguments<sup>2</sup> submitted by plaintiffs in *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001*, 03-md-1570, the consolidated multidistrict litigation arising out of the 9/11 Attacks, this Court on December 22, 2011, and again on August 31, 2015, granted Orders of Judgment on Liability in favor of the *Havlish, Ashton, O'Neill, Federal Insurance*, and *Hoglan* groups of plaintiffs against the Iran Defendants (*See* 03-md-1570, ECF Nos. 2516, 3014, 3016, 3020, 3020-23). After granting the *Havlish* Order of Default Judgment on Liability, this Court

---

<sup>2</sup> In each of the Orders of Judgment regarding plaintiffs’ claims against Iran in the *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001* multidistrict litigation, the Court premised its determination “[u]pon consideration of the evidence submitted by the Plaintiffs in filings with this Court on May 19, 2011, July 13, 2011, and August 19, 2011, and the evidence presented at the December 15, 2011, hearing on liability, together with the entire record in this case.” 03-md-1570, ECF Nos. 2516, 3014, 3016, 3020-22; *see also* 03-md-1570, ECF No. 3023 (substantially similar language).

considered the issue of damages suffered by the *Havlish* plaintiffs and their decedents. Upon the submissions of the *Havlish* plaintiffs, on October 3, 2012, this Court found, among other things, that “Plaintiffs may recover for[, inter alia,] solatium . . . in an action under Section 1605A. 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(c)(4). In such an action, . . . family members can recover solatium for their emotional injury; and all plaintiffs can recover punitive damages.” 03-md-1570, ECF No. 2623 at 2-3, quoting *Valore v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 700 F. Supp. 2d 52, 83 (D.D.C. 2010). This Court also found that the following solatium awards for family members are appropriate, as an upward departure from the framework in *Estate of Heiser v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 466 F. Supp. 2d 229 (D.D.C. 2006).

<b>Relationship of Decedent</b>	<b>Solatium Award</b>
Spouse	\$12,500,000
Parent	\$8,500,000
Child	\$8,500,000
Sibling	\$4,250,000

03-md-1570, ECF No. 2623 at 4. The Court has applied the same solatium values to claims of other solatium plaintiffs in the *Burnett/Iran* case (ECF No. 3666) and other solatium plaintiffs in other cases coordinated in the *In re Terrorist Attack on September 11, 2001* multidistrict litigation. See, e.g., 03-md-1570, ECF Nos. 3175 at 2; 3300 at 1; 3358 at 9; 3363 at 16; 3399; and 3977 at 7.

In that same decision in *Havlish*, this Court also found that Plaintiffs are entitled to punitive damages under the FSIA in an amount of 3.44 multiplied by their compensatory damages award. 03-md-1570, ECF No. 2623 at 5. The Court has applied that 3.44 multiplier also to judgments in the *Ashton* case. See 03-md-1570, ECF No. 3175, at 3 (Report and Recommendation to apply 3.44 punitive multiplier); 03-md-1570, ECF No. 3229 at 1 (Order adopting in its entirety Report and Recommendation to apply 3.44 punitive multiplier). The Court applied the 3.44 punitive multiplier to the compensatory awards previously awarded in *Burnett/Iran*. ECF No. 3666.

However, in *Hoglan*, another case in this multidistrict litigation, Magistrate Judge Netburn recommended that the plaintiffs' request for punitive damages be denied without prejudice. 03-md-1570, ECF Nos. 3358 at 11-16 and 3363 at 28. Judge Daniels adopted Judge Netburn's Reports and Recommendations in their entirety. 03-md-1570, ECF Nos. 3383 at 2 and 3384 at 6.

In the *Havlish* decision, this Court also found that prejudgment interest was warranted for the Plaintiffs' solatium damages. 03-md-1570, ECF No. 2623 at 5. The *Havlish* plaintiffs sought application of a 4.96% interest rate, which the magistrate judge recommended (03-md-1570, ECF No. 2619 at 13-14) and Judge Daniels adopted (03-md-1570, ECF No. 2623 at 5). In *Ashton*, plaintiffs sought, and the magistrate judge recommended, application of a statutory nine percent simple interest rate for prejudgment interest. 03-md-1570, ECF No. 3175 at 7-8. Judge Daniels adopted the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and has applied the nine percent interest rate in multiple instances in the *Ashton* and *Bauer* matters. See 03-md-1570, ECF Nos. 3229 at 2; 3300 at 1; 3341 at 1. However, in *Hoglan*, Magistrate Judge Netburn recommended that the 4.96 percent rate for prejudgment interest should be applied to all of the solatium claims, 03-md-1570, ECF Nos. 3358 at 17-20 and 3363 at 28-29. Judge Daniels adopted Judge Netburn's *Hoglan* Report in its entirety and applied an interest rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually. 03-md-1570, ECF Nos. 3383 at 2 and 3384 at 6. The Court applied that interest rate, 4.96 percent per annum, to the awards to other plaintiffs in *Burnett/Iran*. See, e.g., ECF No. 3666.

**b. *Burnett, et al. v. Iran Defendants***

The *Burnett/Iran* plaintiffs filed suit on December 18, 2015, against the Iran Defendants. Service on the Central Bank was effectuated on March 18, 2016, and on Iran and the IRGC on September 14, 2016. 15-cv-9903 ECF No. 67 at ¶¶ 3-4. At Plaintiffs' request, the Clerk of the Court issued a Certificate of Default as to the Iran Defendants on December 5, 2016. 15-cv-9903 ECF No. 67. On December 1, 2016, Plaintiffs requested judgment as to liability against the Iran Defendants, 15-cv-9903 ECF Nos. 65, 66, which application was amended on December 6, 2016 (15-cv-9903 ECF Nos. 68, 69), after the Clerk of the Court issued a Certificate of Default on December 5, 2016. ECF No. 67. The Court granted judgment as to liability against the Iran defendants in favor of all plaintiffs on January 31, 2017. 15-cv-9903 ECF No. 85. On July 31, 2017, June 8, 2018, August 28, 2018, September 13, 2018, September 4, 2018, September 3, 2019, September 6, 2019, September 11, 2019, and December 13, 2019 (03-md-1570 ECF Nos. 3666, 4023, 4126, 4175, 4146, 5061, 5062, 5087, 5138, and 5356), the Court granted orders of judgement to different subsets of *Burnett/Iran* plaintiffs who filed for entry of partial final default judgments.

The *Burnett/Iran* plaintiff identified in Exhibit A now respectfully requests that this Court grant an Order awarding (1) compensatory damages for pain and suffering in the same per estate amount previously awarded by this Court regarding other estates of decedents killed in the September 11 attacks; (2) prejudgment interest at the rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually for the period from September 11, 2001 until the date of the judgment; (3) permission for the *Burnett/Iran* plaintiff identified in Exhibit A to seek punitive damages or other damages at a later date; and (4) for all other *Burnett/Iran* Plaintiffs not appearing on Exhibit A, to submit applications for damages awards in later stages, to the extent such awards have not previously been addressed.

## II. Damages Under § 1605A

Section 1605A of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) creates an exception to sovereign immunity allowing a foreign state to be held accountable for acts of terrorism or the provision of material support or resources for acts of terrorism where the acts or provision of support or resources were engaged in by an official, employee, or agent of the foreign state while acting within the scope of his or her office, employment, or agency. 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(a)(1). The statute specifies that damages are available “for personal injury or death,” 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(a)(1) and (c)(4), and include “economic damages, solatium, pain and suffering, and punitive damages.” 28 U.S.C. § 1605A(c)(4). Courts addressing the damages available under the statute have held that, among other damages recoverable, “family members can recover solatium for their emotional injury; and all plaintiffs can recover punitive damages. 03-md-1570, ECF No. 2623 at 2-3, quoting *Valore v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 700 F. Supp. 2d 52, 83 (D.D.C. 2010).

### **a. Pain and Suffering Damages**

The plaintiff identified in Exhibit A includes the estate of an individual killed in the 9/11 Attacks whose claim is being pursued by a designated estate representative and seeks damages for the decedent’s pain and suffering. This Court previously assessed the entitlement and value of pain and suffering awards to estates for their decedents’ deaths in this litigation. *See* ECF No. 2618 at 7-9. For the reasons articulated by this Court in the context of the *Havlisch* case, the estate identified in Exhibit A respectfully requests that the Court grant an award for the decedent’s pain and suffering in the amount of \$2,000,000. *See id.* at 9; ECF No. 2624 at 1, 3-4 (Judge Daniels awarding \$2,000,000 per estate in *Havlisch*).

### **b. Punitive Damages**

Under the FSIA, plaintiffs are also entitled to punitive damages. *See* 28 U.S.C. §1605A(c)(4). In the *Havlish* Report and Recommendation on Damages, the magistrate judge explained that a “3.44 ratio ‘has been established as the standard ratio applicable to cases arising out of’ terrorist attacks.” (ECF No. ECF 2619, at 13, citing *Estate of Bland v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 831 F. Supp. 2d 150, 158 (D.C. 2011)). This Court adopted that recommendation and awarded punitive damages on each compensatory damages category at a ratio of 3.44 (punitive) to 1 (compensatory) (ECF No. 2623). The Court has applied that ratio to awards for plaintiffs in other related cases. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 3175, at 3 (Magistrate Judge Maas Report and Recommendation to apply 3.44 punitive multiplier); ECF No. 3229, at 1 (Judge Daniels adopting in its entirety Judge Maas’s Report and Recommendation to apply 3.44 multiplier); ECF No. 3300, at 1 and Exhibit A (Judge Daniels applying 3.44 punitive multiplier to claims in *Ashton*).

However, in *Hoglan*, another case in the *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001* multidistrict litigation, Magistrate Judge Netburn recommended that the plaintiffs’ request for punitive damages be denied without prejudice. ECF No. 3363, at 28. Judge Daniels adopted Judge Netburn’s Report in its entirety, denying without prejudice the plaintiffs’ request for punitive damages. ECF No. 3384, at 6.

In light of the Court’s decision in related litigation to defer determination of punitive damage issues until a later stage of the litigation, Plaintiff herein requests permission to address the issue of punitive damages at a later date. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 3666 (Judge Daniels order in *Burnett/Iran*, authorizing other plaintiffs to make an application for punitive damages at a later date consistent with any future rulings of the Court).

### **c. Prejudgment Interest**

An award of prejudgment interest is within the sound discretion of a trial court and is warranted when plaintiffs are delayed in recovering compensation for non-economic injuries caused by acts of terrorism. *See Baker v. Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahirya*, 775 F. Supp. 2d 48, 86 (D.D.C. 2011). This Court awarded the *Havlish* plaintiffs prejudgment interest at a rate of 4.96% on their pain and suffering damages awards, to be calculated from September 11, 2001 until the date of judgment (ECF 2619 at 13-14). This Court, recognizing that prejudgment interest was appropriate in cases such as this case, adopted the magistrate judge's reasoning, finding that an award of prejudgment interest was appropriate and accepting the rate of 4.96%, as proposed by the *Havlish* plaintiffs' expert.

After the *Havlish* award, plaintiffs in *Ashton* and *Bauer* proposed, and the Court agreed, that prejudgment simple interest at the New York State statutory rate of nine percent per annum was appropriate in cases where the injuries arose in New York and the prejudgment interest used in *Havlish*, 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually, should be reserved for only those cases where the injuries arose in other states. *See* ECF Nos. 3229 at 2; 3300 at 1; 3341 at 1.

The Second Circuit has held that New York State's statutory prejudgment interest rate should apply to the damages awarded to World Trade Center complex leaseholders in their litigation against American Airlines and United Airlines brought under the federal Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act ("ATSSSA"). *World Trade Farmers Market, Inc. v. American Airlines, Inc. (In Re: September 11th Litigation)*, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 16619, \*66 (2d Cir. Sept. 17, 2015). In that case, the Second Circuit concluded that a federal cause of action under the ATSSSA must look to state rules concerning prejudgment interest. *Id.* Accordingly, the Second Circuit held that New York's statutory prejudgment interest rate of nine

percent as opposed to a lower rate crafted under federal law, had to be applied to the plaintiffs' 9/11 claims. *Id.*

However, more recently, in *Hoglan*, Magistrate Judge Netburn recommended that the 4.96 percent interest rate for prejudgment interest should be applied to all of the solatium claims. ECF No. 3363 at 28-29. Judge Daniels adopted Judge Netburn's *Hoglan* Report in its entirety and applied the interest rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually to all of the claims. ECF No. 3384 at 6.

In light of the Court's decision in the *Hoglan* matter, applying the 4.96 percent rate to prejudgment interest, the *Burnett/Iran* Plaintiff identified in Exhibit A respectfully requests that the clerk be directed to award prejudgment interest at the rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually, running from September 11, 2001 until the date of the judgment.

### **III. Conclusion**

For all of the reasons herein, as well as those set forth in the submissions of the other plaintiffs in this case and plaintiffs in the other 9/11 related cases in the *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001* multidistrict litigation, the *Burnett/Iran* plaintiff identified in Exhibit A respectfully requests that this Court award damages for decedent's pain and suffering in the amount of \$2,000,000 per estate; prejudgment interest at the rate of 4.96 percent per annum, compounded annually for the period from September 11, 2001 until the date of the judgment; grant permission for the *Burnett/Iran* plaintiff identified in Exhibit A to seek punitive damages or other appropriate damages at a later date; and grant permission for all *Burnett/Iran* Plaintiffs not appearing on Exhibit A to submit applications for damages awards in later stages, to the extent such awards have not previously been addressed.

Dated: February 11, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John M. Eubanks

John M. Eubanks, Esq.  
Robert T. Haefele, Esq.  
MOTLEY RICE LLC  
28 Bridgeside Blvd.  
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464  
Tel: 843-216-9000  
Fax: 843-216-9450  
Email: jeubanks@motleyrice.com  
Email: rhaefele@motleyrice.com

Attorneys for the *Burnett/Tran* Plaintiffs